DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 465 SO 019 548

AUTHOR Tonkin, Humphrey
TITLE Positioning Global Education for the 1990s: Higher Education Strategies. Remarks to the Sub-Plenary Session.
PUB DATE 16 May 88
NOTE 6p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Forum on Education and International Competence (St. Louis, MO, May 13-16, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; College Second Language Programs; Curriculum Development; Educational Improvement; Foreign Countries; *Global Approach; Higher Education; *International Education; *Second Language Instruction; *Travel
IDENTIFIERS *Internationalism; *Personal Experiences

ABSTRACT

One of the obstacles to the internationalization of college curriculums is the nature of faculty training. In recent years there has been a decline in second language requirements for the doctoral degree, and, as a result, college faculties become increasingly anglophone in their research. But there is a considerable pool of international experience among the faculties at larger universities that is not being used in the classroom to promote internationalism. These faculty members are classified as: (1) the "missionary" who does consulting abroad but knows no foreign languages; (2) the "converted" for foreign-born faculty member who does not bring the earlier foreign experience into the classroom; (3) the "plunderer" who does research abroad but publishes only in U.S. journals; and (4) the "bon-vivant" who travels abroad for pleasure. To encourage faculties to share their experiences, universities must promote revision of the curriculum to incorporate this experience and increase released time for faculty development, sabbaticals, and travel funds. Foreign language knowledge can provide students and scholars with a better understanding of world perspectives, and second language instruction should be encouraged. (DJC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302465

American Forum on Education and International Competence

St. Louis

13-16 May 1988

Sub-Plenary Session:

Positioning Global Education for the 1990s: Higher Education Strategies

Remarks of

Humphrey Tonkin, President

Potsdam College of the State University of New York

Humphrey Tonkin
Potsdam College
Potsdam, NY 13676

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

HUMPHREY TONKIN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

30 019 548

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There are different routes to internationalization, and each institution will use a slightly different strategy. The program currently underway at Ramapo College in New Jersey, for example, is massive in scope, and expensive. It can be reproduced in other parts of the country only if there is a level of governmental commitment that is still not apparent elsewhere - though it is worth pointing out that the momentum behind international education efforts across the country is such that more and more politicians and opinion makers see it as an important device for dealing with the costs of economic isolationism and for improving America's position in the world.

In these remarks I wish to concentrate on two areas - graduate studies and foreign languages - often given little attention by curricular experts in international studies. Inevitably, much of our discussion today has centered upon undergraduate instruction. The panel represents primarily undergraduate institutions, and in any case when we talk of internationalization we generally think of college and below.

But one of the main obstacles in the way of internationalization at the undergraduate level is the nature of faculty training itself, indeed the very configuration and organization of academic research. It shows a sharp United States and anglophone bias. While the founder of the social science disciplines and some of their key figures - Weber, Marx, Humboldt, Hegel, Freud, Grotius, Rousseau - may not have been anglophone, they have in effect become honorary Americans seldom, if ever, read by Americans in the original and often divorced from their European context. The social science disciplines themselves remain relatively untested by concepts emanating from outside Europe and North America, even though their subject matter may be those very concepts themselves. The field of education is no exception, and our future teachers suffer as a result.

Natural scientists in the United States show a marked bias towards anglophone citations. The vast majority of the works that they read are in their own language, and they cite far less foreign-language material than, say, the French or the Russians. This could of course be because of the relative strength of American science, but there is statistical evidence to suggest that this does not fully account for the bias. Indeed, repeated emphasis on the supposed superiority of science in this country may in itself be evidence of a certain ethnocentrism. (The problem here, by the way, is not just one of language: British scientists cite more foreign-language sources than Americans, but show a British bias almost as marked as the American one.)

The problem of bias also extends to humanists. When I moved to this country, I found that even in the study of English literature the American gods were different from the British ones. Given the differences between the British and the American experience, it is perhaps inevitable, and salutary, that a different set of American critics should explain British literature to Americans, but the split went further than that: several .pa

major critics working on this side of the Atlantic were simply not read, or underappreciated, on the British side, and, in a measure, vice versa. Not enough was done, then as now, to bridge the Atlantic, even though the subject was the literature of Britain.

These biases, then, are general. It is essential that we re-examine the whole matter of foreign influences (in the most positive sense) and foreign languages (in a more than perfunctory way) in the design of our graduate curricula. Currently we pay insufficient attention to either. We are producing Ph.D.'s who are ignorant about the world and unaware of their biases or of the means to overcome them. In recent years there has been a decline in language requirements for the Ph.D., but this is in part because the language requirements were never sufficiently demanding or wholehearted. The answer is not restoration of these so-called reading requirements, but the introduction of systematic language instruction, remedial if necessary, for doctoral candidates, along with a significant rethinking of the canonical texts in the disciplines themselves, and revision of the curriculum in the individual disciplines to reflect a broader, less americocentric view.

Despite what I have just said, at larger institutions there generally does exist a considerable pool of international experience among the faculty, particularly in advanced fields. But it does not always rub off on the curriculum. Among the faculty members with international experience we can identify certain types. Let me offer the following, at least partially serious, taxonomy:

1. The missionary. This type takes frequent visits abroad, flying off here and there to consult, to talk with government officials, to give the same lectures abroad as he or she gives at home. No knowledge of foreign languages. Probably a social scientist, perhaps in management or organizational behavior.

2. The converted. The foreign-born faculty member whose courses are sharply orthodox and americanized and who pays little or no attention to new developments abroad, making no use in the classroom of earlier foreign experience. Probably an engineer.

3. The plunderer. He or she spends weeks or months holed up in foreign libraries, returning to this country to publish English-language studies at American university presses primarily for American scholars, and to give papers at U.S. conferences. Teaches American history out of a standard textbook because we are short-handed this semester.

4. The bon-vivant. He or she takes frequent vacations abroad and knows the best restaurants in Paris and Bangkok, and a wonderful little Cantonese place in Ouagadougou. The best teacher of calculus on campus.

The list can be extended almost infinitely, but you have a sense of what I am driving at: the foreign experiences of our faculty members are little exploited in the classroom, because of bias, or inertia, or a simple unwillingness to share or allow others to share.

In short, the major question that faces us is, What can we do to bring foreign experience and the curriculum together? Above all, we can try to create inducements for faculty members to revise their courses to draw on their own foreign experience or to integrate it into their frame of reference as researchers and as teachers (the civil engineer may need the former, the historian the latter). We must demonstrate, with money and attention, that we value foreign experience and that we want it to influence the curriculum. Released time for faculty development, sabbaticals, travel funds and the like are important here. Most institutions have some money for such purposes, but it should be focused and directed to this end. Maximum use should be made of external funding sources, particularly the Fulbright program, which in some areas of the world is undersubscribed.

There will be those who lack foreign experience, who speak no foreign languages, or who work in fields remote from foreign influence. Special programming (bringing in specialists in nursing from abroad, specialists in education from other countries, foreign business people and so on) may help. If possible, we should promote inducements for foreign language learning, and particularly for the use of foreign languages in the classroom.

This brings me to my final point: foreign languages. In many smaller institutions, the foreign language department is one of the largest reserves of foreign experience. It may be the very core of an internationalizing effort. There are two problems: first, non-language faculty members, including those in the social sciences where international elements in the curriculum are not common and where the potential for growth is greatest, are often incompetent in foreign languages; second, language faculty members are often sharply eurocentric in their background and training. Foreign languages can be windows on the world, not just on single foreign cultures. What does Le Monde say about the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and what does that tell us about France and the French and about Afghanistan itself? What does Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung say? What do Granma or La Prensa say? What can we discover from Russian TV? Foreign language faculty members hold the keys to this knowledge. No barrier is greater, and no barrier is more important to overcome, than the barrier between foreign language and the social sciences. If I had just one place to put my energies in the internationalization of an institution, that is where I would put it. A foreign language requirement in a setting that includes the social sciences along with the humanities (and the natural sciences too, for that matter) is more likely to succeed by making foreign languages demonstrable roads to greater knowledge, demonstrably germane to all learning.

Finally: obstacles. There is time only for a few thoughts. "Internationalization", says the blurb for this meeting, "requires careful and inclusive planning." Yes indeed. But sometimes a large and comprehensive planning effort may prove too threatening for an institution, and the correct route is an indirect route: small-scale support for, or expansion of, the foreign language department; individual faculty development grants; expansion of study abroad programs; recruitment of very good foreign students. In this way, suspicions of things foreign or resentment at being asked to change traditional philosophies will fade away as the climate changes. Most of us cannot change the weather, but we can learn which crops to grow in which places, and hence nourish ourselves in different ways. So it is with internationalization: gradualism and subtle reward may in some instances be best. Choose your method -- and go for it!

Bibliographical Note

On linguistic biases in the sciences, see J.A. Large, The Foreign-Language Barrier: Problems in Scientific Communication (London: Deutsch, 1983). On practical ways of bringing foreign languages and the rest of the curriculum together, see Humphrey Tonkin, "Grassroots and Treetops: Collaboration in Post-secondary Language Programs," in John M. Darcey, ed., The Language Teacher: Commitment and Collaboration (Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1987), pp. 26-60, and Humphrey Tonkin and Jane Edwards, The World in the Curriculum: Curricular Strategies for the 21st Century (New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1981).